

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the due consideration given the application. No new matter is believed to be added to the application by this Response.

Status Of The Claims

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 9 and 12 are independent.

Election/Restriction

The Examiner has restricted the claims of the invention into the following two groups:

- I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a method for forming an active substrate for an LCD.
- II. Claims 9-14, drawn to a method for forming a color filter substrate for an LCD and an LCD having the color filter substrate.

The Examiner requires election of one of the aforesaid groups for prosecution on the merits.

Applicants elect Group I (claims 1-8) with traverse.

If Group I is elected, the Examiner requires election of the following species if no generic claim is found to be allowable:

Group IA. An active substrate as shown in Fig 3 (claims 1-4).

Group IB An active substrate formed as shown in Fig. 5 (claims 5-8).

Applicants elect the species of Group IA (claims 1-4) with traverse.

As set forth in Section 803 of the MPEP, the Examiner must examine an application on the merits if the examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden. Two criteria are identified for proper requirement for restriction:

1. The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and
2. There must be a serious burden on the Examiner if the restriction is not required.

Applicant respectfully submits that a serious burden has not been placed on the Examiner to consider all of the claims in a single application. A review of the subject matter set forth in the claims would have an overlapping search. Thus a different field of search really does not exist with regard to the claims of the present application.

Further, Applicant particularly points out the interrelationship between Group I and Group II. Independent claims 1 and 5 of Group I and independent 9 of Group II are each drawn to a fabrication method for a liquid crystal display device. Claim 12 of Group II is drawn to a liquid crystal display device. As a result, all the independent claims of the present invention are so intimately interrelated that no undue burden is placed upon the Examiner to examine all the claims of the invention.

Accordingly, rejoinder and examination of all of the claims of the invention on the merits is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/814,141
Response dated January 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

Docket No.: 0630-1979P

Conclusion

If there are any questions regarding this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert E. Goozner, Ph.D. (Reg. No. 42,593) at 703-205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



By Esther H. Chong
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant